

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 6, 2005, the Examiner allowed claims 1-4 and 7-16, said claim 18 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form and rejected claims 5, 6, 17 and 19-22. Claims 5, 6 and 19-22 have been cancelled. Claim 18 is rewritten in independent form and is now allowable. Reconsideration of claim 17 as here amended is respectfully requested in light of the following comments.

Claim 17 is directed to a window covering having a line of magnets adjacent to each edge of the window covering material. The claim also requires that a lift cord be behind each line of magnets. As amended, claim 17 defines a first plane through the left edge of the window covering material and to a second plane through the right edge of the window covering material and requires those two planes to be parallel. When the window covering is installed on a rectangular window frame, those planes would be parallel to the vertical sides of the window frame. Amended claim 17 further requires one lift cord to be in a plane that is parallel to the first plane and passes through the first line of magnets. The amended claim also requires a second one of the lift cords to be in another plane that is parallel to the second plane and passes through the second line of magnets. These limitations mean that there is one lift cord behind each line of magnets rather than all lift cords being inboard of the magnets as in the prior art shade shown in Figure 6. Support for these limitations can be found at page 6, lines 16 through 23. The patent specification teaches that such relative positioning of the lift cords and magnets will prevent the magnets as sliding as illustrated in Figure 8 of the application.

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 as anticipated by the prior art shade depicted in Figure 6 of the application. However, in that window covering the lift cords are positioned

inboard of the lines of magnets. Consequently, a plane passing through a lift cord and a line of magnets would not be parallel to the first and second planes of amended claim 17. For that reason claim 17 as amended is not anticipated by the prior art shade shown in Figure 6 of the application.

The Examiner also rejected claim 17 (incorrectly identified as claim 16 in line of 1 of page 3 of the Office Action) as obvious from the window covering shown in Figure 6 of the application in view of United States Patent No. 4,928,743 to Wojtysiak. The '743 patent discloses a kit for constructing a raisable soft curtain mounted on a single conventional U-shaped curtain rod. The depicted example is a balloon shade having four lift cords. Figure 1 of the patent shows a lift cord adjacent each vertical edge of the shade. The Examiner states that it would be obvious from Wojtysiak to move the cords shown in Figure 7 closer to the edge of the window covering as well as to use more cords. However, amended claim 17 defines the position of two lift cords relative to the lines of magnets that are adjacent the opposite vertical edges of the shade. There is no teaching or suggestion in either Figure 6 or Wojtysiak to position a lift cord behind each line of magnets as required by amended claim 17. Moreover, there is no motivation in either the prior art shade of Figure 6 or to relocate the lift cords in the shade of Figure 6 or Wojtysiak to combine the references or to relocate the lift cords in the shade of Figure 6 to be behind the lines of magnets. Consequently, claim 17 as amended is patentable over the prior art.

Application No. 10/774,555
Amendment dated May 31, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

For the foregoing reasons all pending claims are patentable. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lynn J. Alstadt
Registration No. 29,362
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, P.C.
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
Attorney for Applicant

(412) 562-1632